

Faculty Senate Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
April 19, 2007

The minutes can also be found at: <http://www.utc.edu/FacultySenate/minutes.php>

<u>Division</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
President	Gavin Townsend	
Past-President		Richard Rice
At-Large	Jim Hiestand, Randy Walker, Cheryl Robinson, and Judith Wakim	Joanie Sompayrac and Michelle White
Adjunct	Jean Howard-Hill	
Behavioral Sciences	Fritz Efaw, Helen Eigenberg , Lyn Miles and Shela Van Ness	
Business Adm.	Debbie Archambeault, Diane Halstead, hris Brockman, Beni Asllani	
Eng & Comp Sci	Kathy Winters and Ignatius Formunung	Roger Briley and Claire McCullough
Fine Arts	Mac Smotherman	Stuart Benkert and Jillian Zwilling
CHEPS	Dolly Gerregano, John Freeman, Kay Lindgren, Dana Wertenberger, and Michelle Vineyard	Linda Johnston
Humanities	Felicia Sturzer, Jennifer Beech, Rebecca Jones, Joe Wilferth, and Bryan Hampton (for Matthew Guy)	
Library	Mike Bell	Jason Griffey
Math & Sciences	Sharon Brueggeman, Bob Marlowe, Betsy Darken, and Manuel Santiago	
Ex-Officio	Herb Burhenn, David Pittenger, and Theresa Liedtka	Richard Brown, Roger Brown, Jocelyn Sanders, and Hugh Prevost
SGA Liaison	Natalie Talbott	

Among the guests present: Linda Orth, Fran Bender, mary Tanner, Yvonne Kilpatrick, Yancy Freeman, Shasta Westmoreland, Lee Pierce, Charles Nelson and Chuck Cantrell

Summary: The Senate passed a motion to make a recommendation to the administration to increase the minimum ACT acceptance score from 17 to 18, effective Fall 2008. Additionally, the Senate voted to change “Conditional Admission” to “Exceptions to Regular Admission Requirements”. These new exceptions were based on suggestions made by the Standards Committee. The Senate also passed a motion to reduce the number of annual meetings of the full faculty to one per semester. This motion will go forward to the full faculty at the next meeting. Finally, the Senate voted to allow the Adjunct Faculty Representative to Faculty Senate to have a vote in full faculty meetings.

1. Call to Order:

Meeting was called to order at 3:13 P.M.

2. Approval of minutes from April 5, 2007:

Minutes were approved by voice vote with the following changes: (1) Under “Summary”, change Vs to vs. (2) Part 3, first paragraph, add 299 after FLG. (3) Part 4, 4th paragraph, change “prefer” to “want”, (4) Part 4, 8th paragraph, the unidentified person was Michelle White, (5) Part 5, 4th paragraph, 2nd sentence, after “because” insert “in Roberts Rules of Order”. (6) Part 6a, 4th sentence should say “Jim Hiestand asked what happens to a student who receives 4C’s and a D.”

3. Standards Committee (Fran Bender)

- a. Change to admission standards

Fran Bender brought two recommendations from the committee. The first motion deals with raising the minimum ACT score from 17 to 18. The vote in the committee was 5 – 3. There were people on the committee who felt it was a better idea to wait until the strategic planning process is complete. These people were not necessarily against the change. Others (who voted for the motion) felt that UTC could not wait. A handout was presented (Appendix A) that contains current data on conditional admissions.

Discussion on the recommendation to raise the ACT minimum to 18: Jim Hiestand asked what the minimum was at Knoxville. Yancy Freeman stated that there is not necessarily a minimum ACT score, but rather an average of the incoming class (which is 24 – 28). Felicia Sturzer added that the change should happen now. Additionally, UTC has the lowest standards for admission in the UT-system. By raising the ACT, UTC might attract more students that we are losing.

Gavin Townsend reminded the Senate that the Standards Committee was initially charged with this because of the decline in retention at UTC. Raising ACT scores might not fix the entire problem, but it could help.

Lyn Miles clarified that the median of the UTK 50th percentile is an ACT of 26.

Fritz Efav asked what UTC's mean ACT score. Yancy Freeman answered that the mean average was a 20.9 and the middle 50% was 19 – 21. Manuel Santiago pointed out that the ACT score was raised in 2004 to 17 and the retention numbers are still declining. He also asked about how this would affect SAT. Yancy Freeman stated that the change would make the SAT score 860.

Fran Bender told the Senate that some people on the committee wanted to make a statement and raise the ACT significantly. But, others felt that it did not give high schools/guidance counselors enough time to prepare. Yancy Freeman stated that with the last change (to 17), enrollment dipped by 50 students. This was recovered in the following year.

Lyn Miles wanted to remind the Senate that when the Merger occurred, UTC actually had a one-point lead on UTK's ACT score, but since we have not changed it, UTK has surpassed UTC.

Betsy Darken wondered why the retention numbers decreased so significantly. Yancy Freeman stated that he didn't directly know why the rates have dropped, but he thinks it is due to several factors: lottery scholarships, more on campus housing, etc... As an optimist, Yancy Freeman felt that the numbers may drop in the first year, but should rebound in the successive years.

Kathy Winters asked if UTK has seen a similar drop. And, did UT-Martin see a change in the retention with their change? Yancy Freeman stated that he has seen data on retention rates at other institutions. UTK has seen similar problems as UTC, in comparison to schools of their size. All three UT-system undergraduate programs have seen similar problems. Though UTK's retention rates are higher, they are still being affected.

Rebecca Cook wondered if we were doing this for retention or perception. Fran Bender stated that more than a change in ACT score will be needed to turn around retention. It will take faculty member one-on-one involvement with students in class. Provost Burhenn told the Senate that UTC is second in the 6-yr attrition numbers across TN.

Kathy Winters stated that based on the numbers presented and what was passed at the previous meeting, 71% of the students who had an ACT score of 17 would be considered not in good standing and 70% of students with an ACT score of an 18 would not be considered in good standing. She felt that this therefore was more of a perception issue. Fran Bender stated that students with a 17 would not be left out of admission. This is covered in the next motion.

Shela Van Ness thought that students who needed assistance before taking on a UTC program should attend community colleges. She wondered why UTC had a conditional program. Fran Bender stated that this deals with the second motion. Shela Van Ness stated that she noticed when she taught a freshmen class that many of the students did not belong at UTC. She felt that this brought down the level of the class because masses of people were not prepared for assignments. Felicia Sturzer called the question. There was no objection.

The motion passed the Senate by a vote of 22 – 9 – 0.

b. Change in Policy on “Conditional Admission”

Fran Bender brought a second motion which dealt with “Exceptions to Regular Admission”. The motion passed in the committee 6 – 1 – 1. The committee did not want to limit the number of conditional admissions, but rather look for a natural break.

Shela Van Ness asked who would be told “no”. Yancy Freeman stated that he is a firm believer that ACT is not a good measure of success. He looked at Martin’s conditional admission process. He presented to the Standards Committee that Admissions implement a policy where students, who were below ACT 18, would be evaluated “holistically”. These students would not be automatically admitted. The students would go through a thorough review process. Students who do not meet the regular admission standard would be denied. The students can then appeal for exceptions to the normal admissions policy by submitting more supporting information for review. Helen Eigenberg stated that this is more of a qualitative process and therefore it is difficult to have a specific “cut-off”. Linda Orth asked who would be “holistically” reviewing the applications. Yancy Freeman stated that it would be the Faculty Admissions Committee as well as some Student service offices.

Gavin Townsend asked what kind of students would be automatically rejected. Yancy Freeman stated that currently, students with an ACT of 16 are be denied as well as students who are missing core requirements. Shela Van Ness stated that she felt high school GPA was more indicative of success and that it should be used in the review process. Yancy Freeman stated that students who were conditionally admitted would be reviewed. The goal of Admissions would be to encourage students, who were denied admission based on ACT, to submit more information for review. Shela Van Ness asked if the students who were categorically denied were advised of the community college system. Yancy Freeman stated this was a standard part of the current letter.

Jim Hiestand asked about students who were qualified, but who were missing a unit. Yancy Freeman stated that these students would be admitted but would have to complete the classes in the first 32 hours of enrollment.

Randy Walker asked if the committee or Admissions would post some sort of guidelines so that the students would know what could be submitted. Yancy Freeman answered yes. The goal would be to say “not limited to”. Betsy Darken asked what was wrong with the current system. Yancy Freeman answered that this new approach could help retention rates. It allows the committee to make a better prediction to the success of the students.

Fran Bender stated that conditional admission would not exist anymore. Students who do not meet the requirements would not be admitted. Then, those students who appealed would be evaluated holistically.

Kathy Winters stated that to improve retention rates and to increase attrition of “borderline students”, UTC needs to limit the hours that the students work.

The Senate voted to approve the motion 25 – 3 – 0.

http://www.utc.edu/Departments/fcouncil/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/2007Standards_041907.pdf

4. Report from Executive Committee

a. Recommendation on assembling the full-faculty

This recommendation reduces the assemblies of the faculty to once a semester, but reserves Reading Day as an option for additional meetings. Joe Wilferth stated that the language for this recommendation was drafted by the Handbook Committee, but was brought forward by the Executive Committee.

Discussion: Betsy Darken asked that “in/by” be changed to “by”. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Fritz Efav asked how many people voted in the e-poll. Gavin Townsend answered that 229 people voted in the poll and 77% were in favor of this proposal. Jim Hiestand asked about approval of candidates for graduation. Gavin Townsend answered that the approval of candidates is already done electronically.

The Senate passed this motion by a vote of 27 – 2 – 0.

b. Recommendation on voting on major issues

Discussion: Jennifer Beech suggested that the issue be tabled until the motion on e-voting (in front of the full-faculty) is decided. Gavin Townsend reminded the Senate that the point of double voting was to allow the maximum number of faculty to vote. Jim Hiestand suggested that it be a “postponement” and not a “table”. Jennifer Beech then moved to postpone this issue until the full faculty has voted on the e-voting issue.

This motion passed by a vote of 21 – 6 – 1.

c. Chair of the Part-Time Faculty Committee

The online version of the Faculty Handbook was missing some important information about the Part-Time Faculty Committee. The missing information stated that the chair of the committee is actually the adjunct representative to the Faculty Senate. Jean Howard-Hill asked who chooses committee membership. Gavin Townsend answered that the Committee on Committees chooses the membership.

http://www.utc.edu/Departments/fcouncil/Archives/2000_2010Archives/2006_07/2006_07Attachments/ExecRecommendations_041907.pdf

5. Administrative Reports

The “Provost’s Report” is now available and Provost Burhenn asks that the Faculty use this as a reminder to fill out the report for March 2006 – March 2007.

6. Other Business: None

7. Faculty Concerns:

Jean Howard-Hill asked if the issue of having adjunct faculty representation at the full-faculty meeting was still alive. Gavin Townsend answered that the issue was been reviewed and the executive committee was looking at allowing the adjunct-representative to faculty senate have voting rights at full-faculty meetings. Jean Howard-Hill moved a resolution that the adjunct-representative to faculty senate has voting rights at full-faculty meetings and seconded by Jennifer Beech. **The motion passed by a vote of 21 – 5 – 0.**

Kathy Winters was concerned that some students were having issues with proficiency and the computer placement exam. The issue comes forward when a student is in a major that requires a computer proficiency class. Linda Orth stated that there is a solution to this problem. Students who had passed placement exam can pay a reduced tuition for those credit hours and receive a petition for that class credit.

Fritz Efaw had a concern and read the following statement:

“Three years ago when senate expressed its approval of the doctoral program in education some concern was expressed about the cost of the two doctoral program especially the SIM center. At the time the chancellor said that senate could retract its support of the doctoral programs at any future date if it decided they were a bad idea. I suggest the time has come to re-examine the viability of the doctoral programs.

We were promised the SIM center would more than pay for itself and would bring net revenues to UTC. In fact it seems not to have done so, and to have been a sizeable drain on the academic budget. This is especially the case for those in the SIM center who are not tenured professors, but hold research appointments.

President Petersen has often spoken recently about acquiring one of the world’s largest computers for UT. Yet in his description of plans for this computer he never mentions the SIM center. It seems not to be on his radar screen. The so-called technology corridor of which the SIM center was to have been a part seems not to have any other points with which the SIM center is associated.

If the SIM center were brought to President Petersen's attention perhaps it could be included in his plans and he could have UT make some sizeable contributions to its upkeep and maintenance. Perhaps he could be persuaded to buy the franchise for enough money to replace the drain it has been on UTC these past few years.

I hope the senate will be able to examine these issues over the coming year."

Jim Hiestand responded that the SIM center has met the bench-marks. Furthermore, it is actually called the UT-Sim Center at Chattanooga. Gavin Townsend wondered if it would help to have the Director of the SIM center address the Senate. The Senate will take the concern in consideration.

8. Announcements: None

Jean Howard-Hill announced that her political science class represented UTC well to the legislature in Nashville. The students researched ten different issues within the state of TN (local and county governments). The students presented their findings to several legislative members. The legislative officials were extremely impressed with the UTC students. As a result of this, members of the legislature will visit UTC in the fall.

9. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Gretchen E. Potts
Faculty Senate Secretary
April 20, 2007**

Fall 2005 and Fall 2006 Freshman Conditional Admission Reports

2005 Freshman Class		
1454	<i>Total Class</i>	
230	<i>Cond. Admits</i>	16% of total class
Ethnic Demographics		
112	<i>Caucasian</i>	
106	<i>African Am.</i>	
7	<i>Hispanic</i>	
4	<i>Asian</i>	
1	<i>Indian</i>	
230	Total	118 (51% Minority)
1st yr. Academic P.		
Fall total Cond	GPA Range	
71	0-.99	
69	1.0-1.99	
90	2.0-above	
230	Total	
58	Suspended	
GPA Range	ACT 17 Conditional	ACT 18 Conditional
0-.99	26	17
1.0-1.99	30	9
2.0-above	22	17
Total	78	47
	57 AA, 2 Hisp	18 AA, 2 Asians
Suspended	20 fall 2005	15 fall 2005
	9 spring 2006	1 spring 2006

2006 Freshman Class		
1782	<i>Total Class</i>	
314	<i>Cond. Admits</i>	18% of total class
Demographics		
148	<i>Caucasian</i>	
159	<i>African Am.</i>	
4	<i>Hispanic</i>	
3	<i>Asian</i>	
0	<i>Other</i>	
314	Total	166 (53% Minority)
1st yr. Academic P.		
Fall total Cond	GPA Range	
90	0-.99	
90	1.0-1.99	
130	2.0-above	
314	Total	
88	Suspended	
GPA Range	ACT 17 Cond.	ACT 18 Cond
0-.99	14	28
1.0-1.99	31	18
2.0-above	29	33
Total	74	79
	54 AA, 2 Hisp	47 AA, 1 Asian
Suspended	14	28

ACT Score Breakdown Fall 2006

ACT Score Breakdown				
1781	Fall 2006 Total Freshman Class			
142	17 Comp.			
1639				
159	18 Comp.			
1480				
185	19 Comp.			
1295				
140	20 Comp.			
1155				
ACT	17	18	19	20
Total	142	159	185	140
Caucasian	37	91	122	76
Afr. American	102	66	56	64
Hispanic/Asian	3	2	7	0